

2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Environmental Health Sciences Review Committee

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 09:56:17 AM

1. Department or Agency		2. Fiscal Year	
Department of Health and Human Services		2018	
3. Committee or Subcommittee		3b. GSA Committee No.	
Environmental Health Sciences Review Committee		857	
4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	02/18/1991		
8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date	
No			
9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?	
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law			
12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)	11/20/1985	Continuing	No
15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee			
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this FiscalYear		
17a. Open 0	17b. Closed 2	17c. Partially Closed 0	Other Activities 0
17d. Total 2			

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
NIH Peer Review	11/14/2017	- 11/14/2017
NIH Peer Review	08/21/2018	- 08/22/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 2

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$21,600.00	\$21,600.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$149,066.00	\$151,897.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$61,440.00	\$62,546.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$11,031.00	\$11,230.00

18d. Total	\$243,137.00	\$247,273.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	1.10	1.10

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts... This Committee consists of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications in the fields of environmental health. During this reporting period the Committee reviewed 19 applications requesting \$91,454,321.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Members are selected from outstanding authorities in the scientific disciplines which are of primary importance in environmental health research and manpower needs, e.g., toxicology, pharmacology, epidemiology, pathology, and biochemistry; and who are familiar with the program goals of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Committee held two meetings during this reporting period.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This Committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the Environmental Health Sciences Review Committee were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

Website: This committee does not have a website. Reports: This committee did not produce any reports during this fiscal year. The DFO and the Committee Decision Maker positions are held by the same individual based on the assignment of duties within this Institute. Due to the large number of members associated with this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available on line at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>. Past individual meeting rosters are available by contacting the Designated Federal Official, Dr. Linda K. Bass.

Designated Federal Officer

Linda K Bass Scientific Review Officer

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
ANDERSON, BROOKE	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ATCHISON, WILLIAM	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BARG, FRANCES	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BEGLEY, THOMAS	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CAI, BO	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CARVAN, MICHAEL	09/20/2016	06/30/2019	SHAW PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CAVE, MATTHEW	07/09/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHANG, HOWARD	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHAN, SHERINE	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHEN, JIA	09/16/2014	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ENQUOBAHRIE, DANIEL	07/10/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
FREEMAN, JENNIFER	10/18/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
FRY, REBECCA	09/21/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GREENWALD, ROBY	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HARVILLE, EMILY	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HAYNES, ERIN	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HOOVER, ANNA	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
JANSSEN, BRANDI	08/21/2018	08/22/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KILE, MOLLY	10/06/2014	06/30/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

LAWRENCE, B. PAIGE	09/22/2016 06/30/2020 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MALECKI, KRISTEN	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MORRIS, ANDREW	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MUKHERJEE, BHRAMAR	09/05/2014 06/30/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MUTLU, GOKHAN	07/08/2015 06/30/2019 PROFESSOR AND CHIEF	Peer Review Consultant Member
NEMBHARD, WENDY	11/14/2017 11/14/2017 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND SECTION CHIEF	Peer Review Consultant Member
OHM, JOYCE	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
OPRESKO, PATRICIA	08/29/2017 06/30/2021 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PEARSON, MELANIE	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PERDEW, GARY	11/14/2017 11/14/2017 PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PINNEY, SUSAN	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PUTNAM, ELIZABETH	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
QIAN, ZHENGMIN	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RAMESH, ARAMANDLA	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RAMIREZ, MONICA	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
REAMS, MARGARET	11/05/2015 06/30/2020 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
REILLY, CHRISTOPHER	07/01/2017 06/30/2021 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
REYNOLDS, PEGGY	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 SENIOR RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
RICHARDSON, JASON	09/08/2014 06/30/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RICHBURG, JOHN	11/14/2017 11/14/2017 PROFESSOR AND HEAD	Peer Review Consultant Member
RIZZO, CARMELO	11/14/2017 11/14/2017 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RUNGE-MORRIS, MELISSA	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHLEZINGER, JENNIFER	07/23/2015 06/30/2019 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHULZ, AMY	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SEN, SAUNAK	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR AND CHIEF OF BIOSTATISTICS	Peer Review Consultant Member
SENS, DONALD	11/14/2017 11/14/2017 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHAMASUNDER, BHAVNA	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SILKA, LINDA	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR AND SENIOR FELLOW	Peer Review Consultant Member
SMART, ROBERT	08/21/2018 08/22/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

THURSTON, SALLY	08/21/2018 08/22/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
TSHALA-KATUMBAY, DANIEL	10/06/2014 06/30/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WANG, YINSHENG	07/01/2016 06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WESSLING-RESNICK, MARIANNE	07/01/2016 06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WILLETT, KRISTINE	08/21/2018 08/22/2018	CHAIR AND PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WRIGHT, FRED	07/01/2017 06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZELIKOFF, JUDITH	08/21/2018 08/22/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHANG, HONGMEI	07/01/2017 06/30/2021	PROFESSOR AND DIVISION DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHENG, TONGZHANG	08/21/2018 08/22/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 57

Narrative Description

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary... shall by regulations require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -(A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts...

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

Not Applicable

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

482

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant Review

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

The results of the IRG Peer Review are highly confidential and no feedback is warranted.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of approved or recommended for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a

number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 19

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 19

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$91,454,321

Grant Review Comments

N/A

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Access Comments

N/A